

REMARKS

Below, the applicant's comments are preceded by related remarks of the examiner set forth in small bold type.

7. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 24 recites the limitation "the corresponding contents" in the last paragraph of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 24 has been amended.

8. Claims 1, 10, 19, 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent Number 6,424,981 issued to Isaac et al (hereafter Isaac).

Referring to claim 1, Isaac discloses a method (Abstract; Field of Invention; col. 2, lines 9-17) comprising:

- identifying characteristic features of a web site ('persistent client state information', 'cookies', col. 6, lines 1-15 and 34-38; col. 7, lines 62-65; Fig. 5, element 116) from an input that specifies the web site (user navigation to a 'URL network address', col. 7, lines 50-59; Fig. 5, element 114; Fig. 3, element 82) the input including an information sample previously obtained from the web site (the URL is the network address of a customizable HTML document at site; Fig. 2, element 58; Fig. 5, element 114; col. 7, lines 57-59);

- extracting contents from the web site based on the identified characteristic features and relevancy of the contents to the information sample ('customization options' for a user are retrieved according to the 'persistent client state information', col. 7, line 66 -col. 8, line 14); and

- updating a personalized web page with the contents (return 'customized HTML document in accordance with customization options', col. 8, lines 15-27; see Fig. 3-6).

The applicant thanks the Examiner for the telephone interview on September 15, 2005. The claims and the prior art references were discussed.

Issac does not disclose or suggest "identifying characteristic features of a web site from an input that includes an identifier that identifies the web site and an information sample previously obtained from the web site; [and] extracting contents from the web site based on the identified characteristic features and relevancy of the contents to the information sample," as recited in amended claim 1.

In Issac, the user inputs a URL to a client computer to identify a customizable HTML document. If the user has customized the HTML document during a previous access of it, the customized HTML document is retrieved. (col. 5, lines 28 to 40)

Although Issac discloses an input that includes a URL that identifies a customizable HTML document, Issac does not disclose or suggest an input that includes an identifier that identifies a web site and “an information sample previously obtained from the web site,” as recited in claim 1.

Moreover, although Issac discloses returning to the user customized HTML documents formed in accordance with customized options stored at a server (col. 8, lines 15-17), Issac does not disclose or suggest “extracting contents from the web site based on ... relevancy of the contents to the information sample,” in which the information sample was previously obtained from the web site.

What is lacking in Issac is also not disclosed or suggested in Nazem, Banjeree, or Breese.

Claims 2-9, 26, and 27, which depend directly or indirectly on claim 1, are allowable at least for the reasons discussed in claim 1. Moreover, these claims add additional distinctive features.

For example, claim 2 recites “repeating the extracting and updating at a frequency specified by the input.” Claim 3 recites “requesting a verification after updating the personalized web page; if the verification confirms the update, adding the contents into a training set; and locating the contents of the web site based on the training set during the extracting and updating. Claim 5 recites “identifying the characteristic features includes identifying a layout of the information sample.” Claim 6 recites “identifying the characteristic features includes identifying a domain keyword in the information sample.” Claim 7 recites “identifying the characteristic features includes identifying a semantic category in the information sample.” Claim 8 recites “identifying the characteristic features includes identifying an event in the input.” Claim 9 recites “assigning a score according to degree of the relevancy of the contents to the information sample; and

requesting a different input if the score is below a pre-determined threshold.” Claim 26 recites “identifying characteristic features of the web site comprises using a computer to automatically identify characteristic features of the web site.” Claim 27 recites “the computer automatically identifies characteristic features of the information sample.”

Claims 10 and 19 are patentable for at least similar reasons as claim 1. Claims 11-18, and 20-25 are patentable for at least the same reasons as the claims on which they depend. Moreover, these claims add additional distinctive features.

Enclosed is a Request for Continued Examination and a \$395 check for the required fee, and a \$510 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, reference 08919-063001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9/16/2005

Rex Huang
Rex I. Huang* for
Y. Rocky Tsao, Reg. No. 34,053

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

** See attached document certifying that Rex Huang has limited recognition to practice before the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office under 37 CFR § 11.9(b).*